

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. In response to the Office Action mailed 12/20/05, Applicant is filing this amendment. Claims 1-16 are pending.

Applicant has noted a typographical error on page 9 of the specification in which an incorrect reference numeral was used for the box designating the ESD clamping circuit. Accordingly, Applicant is submitting an amendment to the specification to correct this error. Applicant requests the Examiner to enter this correction.

In the Office Action mailed 12/20/05, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent 6,285,021; "Takeda"). Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Grassian et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2004/0083315 A1) in view of Mentzer (U.S. Patent 5,535,086). However, in the text of the language for the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection, the Examiner discusses Grassian in combination with Takeda (not Mentzer). Accordingly, Applicant believes that the citation of Mentzer by the Examiner is an error and Applicant will respond to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection based on the combination of Grassian and Takeda.

Applicant submits that Takeda discloses an ESD discharge protection circuit. Takeda may teach the trigger circuit to respond to an applied ESD event but remain inactive during normal operation of the IC (Takeda at col. 1, lines 28-30). However, Takeda states that the NMOSFET 4 will remain conductive for a period of time which is determined by the RC time constant of trigger circuit 8 (Takeda at col. 1, lines 54-56).

The amended independent claims 1 and 9 clearly recite that the ESD triggering circuit has a first time response to sense the ESD event and a second time response for a clamping signal to activate the ESD clamping circuit, in which the first time response is different than the second time response. In Takeda, the one RC time constant is used by the trigger circuit, as well as conducting the NMOSFET.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the amended claims overcome the Examiner's rejections based on Takeda and the combination of Grassian and Takeda, for the reasons noted above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections and allow pending claims 1-16, as amended.

Furthermore, in order to respond to the outstanding office action, Applicant is also submitting a petition for one-month extension of time under a separate cover along with the appropriate fee.

If there are any fee shortages related to this response, please charge such fee shortages to Sigmatel Inc.'s USPTO Deposit Account No. 50-1415.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON, LLP
(Customer No. 34,399)

Date: 4-20-2006

By: William W. Kidd
William W. Kidd
Reg. No. 31,772
Phone: (512) 263-1842
Fax No: (512) 263-1469
Email: wkidd@texaspatents.com